

A1998

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — A

to Kennedy, Freeman and company and we could perhaps wonder how long before the White House news management policy will be applied to the Department of Agriculture's role of providing factual statistical information for farmers.

Let us look briefly at some other direct quotations from the report:

The commercial vegetable index dropped 8 percent during the month.

The March index (for dairy products) was 3 percent below a year earlier and lowest for the month since 1956.

Lower prices for eggs and commercial broilers dropped the index 1 percent during the month to 155.

I point out these instances of declining farm prices as a means of explaining the continued decline of the farmer's parity ratio and more specifically, the farmer's income. I do this for the purpose of keeping the record straight as to the real effect of the administration's farm policies.

Soviet Troops Still in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared recently in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House the Herald Tribune's excellent commentary on the continued presence of Soviet troops in Cuba.

A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

A not-so-funny thing happened on the way to no place at all this week.

At his news conference, President Kennedy was asked a three-part question. Did the administration have accurate information on the number of Soviet troops actually withdrawn from Cuba? Was Mr. Kennedy satisfied with the rate of withdrawal? Was there any arrangement with the Soviets for verification of the withdrawal? "No," said the President, "the answer to your question would really be 'No' to all of them." He grinned. The reporters broke into laughter. And that was that.

It may have been a clever way to handle an embarrassing question, but the answer—or at least its implications—didn't strike us as particularly amusing. Or reassuring.

The situation in Cuba is certainly better today than it was last October, before Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviets to dismantle their offensive missile bases. But it's far worse than it was a year ago, or 2 years ago. And one of the principal reasons is the continued presence of those Soviet troops which, the President acknowledged, are not being withdrawn at a pace he considers satisfactory. Nor are most other Americans likely to consider the pace satisfactory.

The troops may not be preparing to invade Miami, but they do constitute a clear and present danger to the hemisphere. They are in Cuba precisely because it suits Mr. Khrushchev's purposes to keep them there. And we all know what his purposes are.

Khrushchev, Castro and Co. aim to sub-

vert free governments throughout the hemisphere and we have recently been treated to some expert testimony by CIA Director McCone on the extent of Cuban efforts to export revolution. Mr. McCone told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that "at least 1,000 to 1,500 persons" from other Latin American countries went to Cuba in 1962 for training in such subjects as sabotage and guerrilla warfare. Soviet "technicians" can play a major role in such training; they also bolster the Castro regime against threats from the Cuban people. And as long as they remain, the possibility remains that Mr. Khrushchev might clandestinely reintroduce his missiles.

Whatever their activities in Cuba, we can be sure of one thing: we—the free nations of the hemisphere—are the target of those activities. Mr. Khrushchev didn't send his troops to the Caribbean for a holiday, and he isn't keeping them there to spare them a Moscow winter.

The Reds—What Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn Tablet, the weekly publication of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn, N.Y., is one of the most respected and effective publications of this nature in the country.

In its issue of March 28, it carried an article by Louis F. Budenz which emphasizes the obvious fact that aid to Red Poland strengthens Moscow.

In view of the proposals in this year's foreign aid bill which have just been made at the insistence of the administration, showing extremely favorable consideration to Poland and Yugoslavia, I feel this article is extremely timely, and I insert it into the Record at this point:

THE REDS—WHAT NOW?—AID TO RED POLAND STRENGTHENS MOSCOW

(By Louis F. Budenz)

Praise for Joseph Stalin as "a good Marxist and good Communist," uttered by Khrushchev in early March, to be understandable, must be linked up with a big Kremlin endeavor. As highlighted in the February International Affairs, this is the re-creation of Stalin's victims, the captive nation, into economic battering rams against the West.

The aim of the enterprise, as set forth in that issue's leading article, "Council for Mutual Economic Aid and the Six," is to prove "that the planned socialist economy is superior to the 'coordinated' capitalist economy." The narrative covers the alleged differences between the Red-ruled Council for Mutual Economic Aid and the European Common Market. It is naturally directed against us.

RATES FIRST

The first of Stalin's victims among the captive nations, Poland, now allegedly stands highest as an agency to destroy the free world economically. Of 273 industrial enterprises, constructed in "the Socialist countries" with Soviet technical assistance,

Poland rates first in number with 74. Also, it is pointed out, that "in Poland, per capita power output increased tenfold." There are many other statistics leading to the same effect.

In this connection, it may seem strange that I suggest that you study the March-April 1963, number of Mission. This miniature magazine is a publication of Bishop Fulton J. Sheen. In pointing out the Communist persecution of the Catholic Church, it dwells conspicuously on Red Poland.

We are reminded that Cardinal Wyszynski suffered several years in prison, that 91 priests were killed, 260 disappeared without trace, and that 550 were deported. We are also told that 2,133 Catholic churches were closed. We learn, too, surprisingly, that two priests were sent to prison for 3 years for translating Bishop Sheen's own books into Polish.

His Excellency is not concerned with any political or economic aspects in giving us this review. But we as laymen and as American citizens can soberly ask ourselves: What sort of friendly "image" is the United States creating for itself, as some newspapers suggest, by giving favorable trade treatment and support by aid to this atheistic Communist regime?

The answer was furnished last year by Wladyslaw Gomulka himself. He should know, for he is the head of the Polish Communist Party and the Red Polish Government. Gomulka has given an interview which was bitterly anti-American. The Worker of July 15 and 22 published it in full, and I invite you to look it up.

SUPPORTS K.

In the interview, Gomulka started right off by saying: "If it depended on the Soviet Union only, the prospect for peace would be very bright indeed." But he showed that the United States was the other big factor in the international scene and that it indicated no desire for peace. From thence on, he supported item by item Khrushchev's demands on the free world. He raised aloft the banner of peaceful coexistence, implying that America opposed such an idea.

Gomulka knew full well that peaceful coexistence had been the slogan under which Poland had been taken over by Stalin in agreement with Hitler. I have in my hand at this moment No. 9 of the Communist International for 1939, the predecessor as directive giver of the World Marxist Review.

There we have the speech of Premier V. M. Molotov of the Soviet Union on "The Meaning of the Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact," in other words, the Hitler-Stalin alliance. His chief thought is expressed thus: "In our foreign policy toward non-Soviet countries, we have always been guided by Lenin's well-known principle of the peaceful coexistence of the Soviet state and of capitalist countries."

So it was, that peaceful coexistence was the excuse for the betrayal of the West, just as it was for every other major Soviet move. In a word, as Gomulka knows, peaceful coexistence constitutes that favorable cover under which Soviet power can best advance at any particular period.

The great weapons of the socialist bloc against us economically are to be twofold, says International Affairs. They are great joint electric power and oil pipeline systems through all the Red-ruled countries and regimented trade with the West. Socialist trade will gain because of its stable prices, which means the cheap results of slave labor. It is no wonder that the Worker of March 17 advertises many Red Polish products along with East German exports as though they represented Communist buying.